

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 RANDALL MERTH,) Case No.: 1:21-cv-1185 NONE JLT
12 Plaintiff,)
13 v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
14 MANAGEMENT & TRAINING CORP, et al.,) FOR ELECTRONIC FILING PERMISSION
15 Defendants.) (Doc. 2)
16)

17 Randall Merth seeks permission to file documents electronically in this action. (Doc. 2.)
18 Pursuant to Local Rule 133, “Any person appearing pro se may not utilize electronic filing except with
19 the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge.” L.R. 133(b)(2). Instead, pro se parties—
20 such as Plaintiff—must “file and serve paper documents as required by applicable Federal Rules of
21 Civil or Criminal Procedure or by these Rule.” *Id.*

22 A pro se litigant seeking electronic filing permission must follow the guidelines set forth by
23 Local Rule 133(b)(3), which provides: “Requests to use paper or electronic filing as exceptions from
24 these Rules shall be submitted as stipulations as provided in L.R. 143 or, if a stipulation cannot be had,
25 as written motions setting out an explanation of reasons for the exception.” Plaintiff has not identified
26 any reason as to why he should be exempt from the requirement to file documents in paper with the
27 Court in support of his request. (*See* Doc. 2 at 1.) Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 28 1. Plaintiff’s motion for electronic filing permission (Doc. 2) is **DENIED**; and

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE